DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 320 JC 910 159

AUTHOR Silvers, Philip J.
TITLE Utilization of Associate Faculty at Pima Community College: A Report on Surveys of College Associate Faculty and Department Heads.
INSTITUTION Pima Community Coll., Tucson, AZ. Office of Research and Planning.
PUB DATE 31 Jul 90
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjunct Faculty; *Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Department Heads; Employment Practices; Faculty Workload; *Part Time Faculty; Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Orientation; Two Year Colleges; Working Hours

ABSTRACT

In 1990, a study was conducted of Pima Community College (PCC) associate (i.e., part-time) faculty and department heads to determine current practices and perceptions regarding the utilization of part-time faculty. Questionnaires were mailed to 1,500 faculty members and 65 department heads. Highlighted findings, based on a 51% response rate from the part-time faculty and a 59% response rate from the department heads, included the following: (1) half of the part-time faculty indicated that they were available to teach in the mornings and afternoons, nearly half were available on weekdays and over half could teach at any location; (2) 69% of the faculty respondents reported attending an associate faculty orientation session, while 6.3% were unaware of the existence of such an orientation; (3) the typical faculty respondent had at least 10 years of directly related work experience; (4) courses most frequently taught by associate faculty were math, writing, and computers; (5) 18.9% of the faculty respondents reported that their PCC position was their only job; (6) 56% of the faculty respondents indicated that they would apply for a full-time position in their subject area if one were to become available; (7) 93.9% of the department heads rated part-time faculty orientation as excellent or acceptable; (8) 91.7% rated support services as excellent or acceptable; (9) 39% cited low pay as the probable reasons for associate faculty declining job offers at PCC; and (10) 39.5% of the responding department heads cited another job as the main reason why part-time faculty stop teaching. The survey instruments and cover letters, and selected open-ended comments from department heads are appended. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329320

UTILIZATION OF ASSOCIATE FACULTY AT PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A Report on Surveys of

College Associate Faculty and Department Heads

Philip J. Silvers
Office of Research and Planning
Pima Community College
Tucson, Arizona

July 31, 1990

JC 910 159

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. J. Silvers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CONTENTS

	Page
Background	1
Methodology	1
Findings:	
Survey of Associate Faculty	2
Findings	
Survey of PCC Department Heads	10
Discussion	13
Summary	14
References	16
Credits	17
Appendix	
A: Associate Faculty Questionnaire	18
B: Department Head Questionnaire	23
C: Other Comments from Department Heads	26

The Utilization of Associate Faculty at Pima Community College

Background

Utilization of associate faculty at Pima Community College (PCC) has been a point of discussion among administrators and faculty for years. Recently, the 1988 and 1990 North Central Self Studies raised issues regarding use of associate faculty at PCC. The most recent Self Study reports that 58 percent of PCC full-time faculty feel that the current ratio of part-time to full-time faculty serves the College poorly or very poorly. The Self Study expressed "extreme concern... among faculty about the effect of the present ratio on the education."

Comparing PCC's practices with community colleges nationwide, Cease (1990) showed that PCC's utilization of associate faculty was 43 percent higher for headcount faculty and 144 percent higher for course sections taught than the national averages for community colleges. He also estimated conservatively that PCC's instructional costs for associate faculty are one-third of the costs of full-time faculty. If one were to include benefits and overhead expenses, associate faculty cost could be as low as one-fifth that of full-time faculty.

Cohen and Brawer (1989) as well as Hartleb and Vilter (1986) provide extensive lists of the strengths and liabilities of using associate (part-time) faculty at community colleges. Cohen and Brawer note that originally associate faculty were hired to teach in areas of specialized expertise where the limited demand did not require multiple sections. Gradually and for various reasons, the use of associate faculty increased and has become a major source of cost-efficiency in the college budgets. On the downside, associate faculty are generally not available to students outside of class and are not as familiar with the college infrastructure of support services for students. Some also question the consistency of instructional practices with a large number of associate faculty.

In response to the concerns about faculty utilization, the College in 1989 established a task force to study and make recommendations regarding the recruitment, selection, orientation, development, evaluation, and supervision of full-time and associate faculty. In addition, in response to a June 1990 request from the Board of Governors, the PCC Chancellor commissioned preliminary surveys of associate faculty and PCC department heads to determine current practices and perceptions regarding the critical associate-faculty issues raised in the literature and by College faculty and staff. This report covers the findings of these preliminary surveys.

Methodology

In the survey of associate faculty, all who had taught from July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1990 were selected for the sample. The survey was not intended to include full-time faculty who teach as associate faculty on an overload basis. Fifteen hundred associate faculty were surveyed. The survey questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix A) were sent on June 29 to the respondents' home address, with a prepaid-postage return envelope. A total of 757 (51 percent) responded within the requested 12-day turnaround

time. The survey instrument was developed to elicit responses regarding associate-faculty issues raised in the literature, by College faculty and staff, and by members of the Board of Governors. The instrument was pretested with six associate faculty, reviewed by College executives, and revised prior to the survey mailing. Responses to open-ended questions on the completed questionnaires were reviewed by staff and coded for the data tabulation. The SPSS-X statistical package was used in the analysis of both surveys.

A total of 65 department heads from the four campuses and the Education Center South was selected for the second survey. At the community campus, the associate dean of instruction and the director of telecourses were included because they perform many of the duties of department heads at other campuses. Similarly, the coordinator of instructional services at the Education Center South was selected in lieu of a department head there. Of the 65 surveyed, 38 (59 percent) responded by the mid-July deadline. The questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix B), with a prepaid response envelope, were mailed to the respondents' home address. The questionnaire for department heads was also based on the issues in the literature and on issues raised recently within the College community. The instrument underwent several internal reviews and revisions prior to mailing.

It should be noted that this study was intended to be preliminary and exploratory in nature. The surveys were conducted during the month of July because of the urgency to provide an empirical basis for the College's current discussions of associate-faculty issues. The College intends to continue its study of associate faculty over the coming months.

Findings: Survey of Associate Faculty

The value of these survey findings depends, in part, on how well the respondents resemble the total population of PCC associate faculty. While the 51-percent response rate is exceptionally strong for a survey of this type, the reader is cautioned that all surveys contain some degree of response bias. One way of assuring that respondents are representative of the general population is to compare their characteristics to those that are known of the target population. While the College currently does not have definitive data on associate faculty characteristics, the profile contained in the following paragraphs is quite similar to those obtained from other surveys of associate faculty. It should be noted that this survey includes **only those who have taught for the College** and does not include those who--for whatever reason--declined to teach.

Based on reports of courses taught, respondents were categorized as either Arts and Sciences or Vocational instructors. Arts and Sciences instructors comprised 67.8 percent of the respondents; Vocational instructors, 32.2 percent. At the East Campus, however, 79.6 percent teach in Arts and Sciences and 76.9 do so at the Education Center South.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were male; 42 percent female. The Community Campus respondents show a slightly higher percentage of males (63 percent) than the other campuses.

Age distribution of respondents was:

Age	N	Percent
< 25	5	.7
25-29	55	25.5
30-39	216	27.0
40-49	259	30.7
50-59	121	13.2
60 >	80	9.1
NR	22	
TOTAL	757	100

The mean age of associate faculty respondents is 43.8, the median 42. A full 73 percent are under the age of 50. No major age differences are evident among campuses.

Respondents were asked to self-identify on ethnicity:

Ethnicity	N	Percent
American Indian	8	1.1
Asian	10	1.4
Black	18	2.4
Hispanic	52	7.0
White	652	88.1
NR	17	
TOTAL	757	100

Based on a 11.9 percent minority representation among all respondents, there was a slightly higher percentage of minority respondents from the Downtown (16.5 percent) and East (16.6 percent) campuses.

When asked to identify the campus at which they teach most often, respondents reported the following:

Campus	N	Percent
Community Campus	234	31.4
Downtown Campus	161	21.6
East Campus	101	13.5
West Campus	209	28.0
Education Center South	32	4.3
Community Services	3	.4
Skill Center	6	.8
NR	11	
TOTAL	757	100

Responses to this question were used as an independent variable by which to analyze responses to other questions according to campus.

The Availability Issue

Respondents were asked about the times and locations at which they were available to teach. Almost half (47.4 percent) are available on weekdays; 38.6 are available on weekends. Half report that they are available in the mornings and afternoons, and 86.1 percent is available during evening hours. Over half (59.3 percent) are available to teach at any location, while 40.6 percent would be selective about teaching locations. A similar percentage (one-fourth each) expressed a preference for the Community, Downtown, and West Campuses, while 14.7 percent preferred the East Campus and the remainder (12 percent) selected either the Education Center South, the Skill Center, or Community Services.

To further determine the availability of associate faculty for teaching opportunities at the College, respondents were asked whether they had ever turned down a teaching offer at PCC. Approximately 25 percent said that they had turned down an offer, most often because of scheduling difficulties (44.2 percent) or current job commitments (22.1 percent). Only 13.5 percent of those who declined did so because of low pay and 6.1 percent did so to avoid exceeding the overload limit. A very few did not prefer the time or location offered, one wanted a break in teaching, and three were sick.

Orientation of Associate Faculty

Sixty-nine percent said that they had attended an associate-faculty orientation session; 6.3 percent claimed to be unaware that an orientation was offered. More East Campus respondents (74.3 percent) and fewer Community Campus respondents (59.8 percent) claimed to have attended orientation. Of those who attended orientation, the quality ratings were mixed. Twenty-eight percent rated the orientation excellent, 43.6 rated it acceptable, and another 28 percent rated it poor.

Qualifications of Associate Faculty

To determine the qualifications of associate faculty, respondents were asked about their academic credentials, related work experience, and teaching experience.

Academic Qualifications	N	Percent
Associate Degree	45	5.9
Bachelor's Degree	241	31.5
Master's Degree	408	53.4
Doctorate	70	9.2
NR/Other	79	---
TOTAL	843*	100

* The questionnaire editing process permitted some double entries

Under the "other" category, some claimed military, foreign degrees, professional certifications, and 49 indicated "none." Thus approximately nine percent of the respondents likely hold no college degree.

The typical associate faculty respondent has at least ten years of directly related work experience, the mean being 14.3 years. Ninety-four percent have three or more years of directly related experience.

With respect to teaching experience, 67.8 percent have five years or more. Only 7.3 percent claim one year's experience and 8.3 percent claim two year's experience. The mean experience is 9.97 years and the median, 7 years.

Most respondents (74.3 percent) report that they keep in contact with others in their disciplines; 25.7 percent do not. Reported peer contact is slightly higher at the East Campus and Education Center South; slightly less at the Community Campus where 63.4 keep in contact.

The typical associate faculty member is in his/her fourth year at PCC. Thirty-one percent have taught at PCC for two years or fewer. Twenty percent have taught at PCC for nine years or more. A simple cohort analysis based on respondents' reported first year at the College suggests a turnover rate of less than 20 percent per year. This is comparable to the turnover in the general population of Pima County.

What They Teach

Respondents were asked to list courses taught from July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990, along with number of credit hours and sections for each course. A list of the courses most frequently taught by associate-faculty respondents is contained in Figure 1, Courses Taught by Associate Faculty. Math, Writing, and Computers head the list. Both courses in arts and sciences and in the occupations are represented. When associate faculty teach more than one course, it is likely to be in Math, Writing, Office Education, Computers, Accounting, or Psychology.

Frequency of Teaching and Teaching Loads

Eighty percent of the respondents teach every semester and 13 percent teach once a year. Eighty-nine percent teach six load hours or fewer. The typical associate faculty teaches three load hours, but 32.4 percent teach six load hours and 13 percent claim to teach more than six load hours.

All respondents taught at least one course during FY 89/90. Of these, 65 percent taught only one section and 24 percent taught two sections, and 11.2 percent taught more than two sections. The mean number of sections for all respondents was 1.59, with a median and mode of 1. Fifty-two percent, or 394, respondents taught more than one course in FY 89/90. Of these, 70 percent taught only one section of the second course and 21 percent taught two sections.

Course	N	Percent
Math	79	10.9
Writing	64	8.8
Computer Science	44	6.1
Office Education	28	3.9
Accounting	28	3.9
Business	24	3.3
Psychology	24	3.3
Spanish	22	3.0
Management	20	2.8
Human Development Ed	16	2.2
Reading	14	1.9
Biology	14	1.9
History	14	1.9
Fitness & Sports	13	1.8
Nursing	12	1.7
English Second Language	12	1.7
Other	329	43.5
TOTAL	757	100

Figure 1. Courses Taught by Associate Faculty

Additionally, 25 percent of the respondents taught more than two courses, 14 percent taught more than three courses, and 5 percent taught more than four courses. Twenty respondents reported that they taught more than five different courses in FY 89/90.

Other Employment

Fifty-three percent of all respondents and 68.8 percent of vocational instructors report that they have a full-time job, another 10.2 percent have a part-time job, and 2.7 percent are self-employed. For 18.9 percent (mostly Arts and Sciences instructors), their PCC associate faculty position is their only job. Another 7.4 percent (mostly in Arts and Sciences) say that they are waiting for a full-time job. A few reported that they were either retired (1.2 percent), pursuing an advanced degree (1.1), or holding several part-time jobs (1.1 percent). From these data, it appears that approximately 26.3 percent of associate faculty respondents may depend upon PCC for their personal income. The questionnaire did not inquire regarding family income or sources other than earnings.

When asked their current occupations, respondents reported the following:

Current Occupation	N	Percent
Professional	260	39.2
Teacher	198	29.8
Technical	58	8.7
Service	41	6.2
Retired	39	5.9
Self-Employed	20	3.0
Unemployed	18	2.7
Other	27	4.1
NR	96	---
TOTAL	757	100

With regard to employment sectors, most are working in education (40 percent), services (27.3 percent), or public administration (12.9 percent). These are followed by manufacturing (5.7 percent), finance/real estate (4.9 percent), transportation (2.9 percent), construction (2.1 percent), and retail (1.9 percent). Over half (51.9 percent) of Arts and Sciences instructors are presently working in the education sector.

Twenty-nine percent (217) teach for other educational institutions. Of these, 44.4 percent teach at a four-year college or university, 34.2 percent teach at a secondary school, and 11.5 at the elementary level. Arts and Sciences instructors are more likely to teach in a secondary school or 4-year college; vocational instructors are more likely to teach in a military or proprietary setting.

Respondents were asked to report their total personal gross income:

Annual Gross Income	N	Percent
< 10,000	83	11.8
10,000-19,999	134	19.0
20,000-29,999	145	20.6
30,000-39,999	155	22.0
40,000-49,999	112	15.9
50,000 & >	75	10.7
NR	53	---
TOTAL	757	100

Almost half of the respondents earned between $20,000 and $40,000 per year, and 30.8 percent less than $20,000 per year.

Motivation for Teaching

In response to the question "What is the primary reason you teach at Pima Community College?", these reasons were reported:

Primary Reason	N	Percent
I just love to teach	204	27.8
Important to me to have someone highly qualified teach the course	135	18.4
More than one reason	100	13.6
Enjoyable diversion	97	13.2
Need the income	76	10.4
Extra money comes in handy	68	9.3
To keep current	12	1.6
Other	42	5.5
NR	23	---
TOTAL	757	100

From these data, at least 70 percent of the respondents teach primarily because they want to teach. For at least 20 percent, compensation is a motivating force. In looking at differences between Arts and Sciences and Vocational instructors, love of teaching is a stronger influence among the former and highly qualified instructor holds more influence for the latter.

Current Employment Interests at PCC

To determine whether a significant number of associate faculty are interested in full-time faculty employment at the College, the survey asked a series of questions. If a full-time position were to open in your subject area, would you apply? Fifty-six percent of the respondents said they would; 44 percent would not. Slightly more Arts and Sciences instructors would apply. Would the respondent accept a position--outright--at the

College right now? Twenty-nine percent would. Another 27.2 percent, 206 respondents, would do so **provided** the conditions were right. Of this latter group, 45 percent said that the pay had to be right, 16 percent cited a combination of conditions, 9 percent said that teaching times had to be right, and 6 percent would be selective about the courses or the location.

Had they applied for a full-time position within the past two years? Only 19.1 percent said that they had applied for a full-time position; 80.9 percent had not.

Are they teaching part-time at PCC so that they can become full time instructors? A total of 26.4 percent said that they were; 73.6 percent said that they were not. Responses to the latter two questions showed that slightly more Arts and Sciences instructors reported themselves to be in the job market.

Other Comments

Respondents were asked whether they had any additional comments to make. Of the 757 respondents, half did comment further. Many took the opportunity to write several paragraphs and even several pages. A content analysis of these comments is currently underway and a complete 45-page transcription of the comments will be distributed to governing board members, College committees, administrators, and others interested with the request that these comments be read in their entirety.

A preliminary review of these comments indicates that four topics emerge as most important: 1) compensation, 2) hiring practices, 3) the 6-loadhour limitation, and 4) support services for--and communication with--associate faculty. Many wrote personal notes to the new Chancellor in response to his cover letter for this survey.

Of those providing further comments, approximately 20 percent commented with emphatic regret about compensation and benefits. Many had creative recommendations for making the total compensation more appropriate. Next in frequency, respondents addressed hiring practices. These largely critical comments attacked the arbitrary and often closed system for hiring associate faculty. Respondents perceive that hiring is done entirely on a whom-you-know basis. A third area of concern is the limitation on the number of units (6) associate faculty are permitted to teach each semester. Many associate faculty desire to teach more than two courses or sections each semester--even within the current compensation framework. The last major area of concern is the support services and communications available for associate faculty. While some extol the quality of services available, e.g., at the Community Campus, many criticized the amount of support available to associate faculty.

The responses to this open-ended question provide a rich resource into the understanding of the mind-set and the concerns of PCC associate faculty. It is evident that many of the respondents took the opportunity seriously in the expectation that their expressions could make a difference.

Findings: Survey of PCC Department Heads

Of the 65 department heads surveyed, 38 (59 percent) responded. By type of department, 25 (65.8 percent) were in Arts and Sciences; 11 (28.9 percent) were Vocational. By campus, the respondents identified themselves as--

Campus	N	Percent
Community Campus	2	5.3
Downtown Campus	9	23.7
East Campus	11	28.9
Education Center South	1	2.6
West Campus	15	39.5
NR	0	--
TOTAL	38	100

Extent of Use of Associate Faculty

Respondents were asked to describe--along several dimensions--the extent of utilization of associate faculty at their campuses. Understandably, there is a natural skew to the responses because at the Community Campus and the Education Center South, all or most faculty are associate faculty.

With respect to the number of associate faculty employed by department, the median response was 13.0, the mode, 6.0. (The mean was not meaningful because the community campus reported over 400 associate faculty.) The number employed for the first time in semester 892 was 1.5 median and 0 mode. In fact, 31.6 percent of the respondents reported having no first-timers in Spring 1990. Another 31.6 reported hiring only one or two new associate faculty during that semester.

Department heads were asked to identify the percentage of load hours taught by associate faculty. Again, the responses from Community Campus and Education Center South tend to skew the mean response of 53.27 percent. The mode, however, was 65 percent and the median 56 percent.

Quality of Orientation of Associate Faculty

On a five-point scale, respondents rated the associate faculty orientation as a 3.1 (mean) and 3.0 for mode and median. Associate faculty orientation was rated excellent by 36.3 percent of the respondents, acceptable by 57.6 percent, and nonexistent by 6.1 percent. Five department heads did not respond.

Quality of Support Services for Associate Faculty

Sixty-one percent of the respondents rated support services as acceptable; 30.6 percent as excellent; and 8.3 percent said they were nonexistent. Two did not respond to this item.

Quality of Instruction

On this item, department heads were asked to rate the quality of the instruction provided by associate faculty in their departments. Twenty-seven respondents (71.1 percent) categorized the instruction as excellent, ten (26.1 percent) said it was acceptable, and one (2.6 percent) said it was poor.

Experience Recruiting Associate Faculty

Thirty respondents (81 percent) reported that associate faculty are reasonably available in their disciplines. Five (13.5 percent) reported a surfeit--they wait-list associate faculty. And two (5.4 percent) said that it is almost impossible to hire them.

Difficulties with the Use of Associate Faculty

Respondents were asked whether they had ever had to cancel a class for lack of available associate faculty. The overwhelming majority (86.5 percent) had not; 13.5 percent had cancelled a class.

Why do associate faculty decline an offer to teach at PCC? Department heads perceive that low pay is the number one problem. Thirty-nine percent cited low pay as the primary reason. Other reasons cited include schedule conflicts (25 percent), other job with better pay (11.1 percent), lack of time (5.6 percent), and other (8.4 percent). Four respondents (11.1 percent) said they had never been turned down, and two did not respond to the question.

Why do associate faculty stop teaching? Most department heads cite another job as the reason (39.5 percent). Twenty-one percent attribute it to low pay, 10.5 say that there are multiple reasons, and 7.9 percent each identify time conflicts, burnout, or "other." Two respondents (5.3 percent) have never had associate faculty quit or stop.

Benefits PCC Derived from Associate Faculty

While the typical benefits are described in the literature, this survey attempted to determine which benefits were most important to PCC department heads. Respondents were asked to prioritize three benefits. Figure 2, Benefits of Associate Faculty, summarizes the responses by total "votes" for each benefit and then weights each benefit by its frequency among the total votes. Flexibility in scheduling was seen to be the top benefit by 21 respondents, followed by expertise and diversity.

Other Comments

Twenty nine out of 38 respondents provided additional comments on the subject of associate faculty. Open-ended questions provide the opportunity for respondents to say what is on their mind, without being led by the questionnaire. These comments are listed verbatim in Appendix C.

Benefit	Number	Percent
Flexibility	21	24 %
Diversity	20	23 %
Expertise	18	20 %
Quality Instruction	6	7 %
Caring Instructors	5	6 %
Financial Savings	5	6 %
Applicant Pool for FT Fac	5	6 %
Other	3	3 %

Figure 2. Benefits from Use of Associate Faculty

A general categorization of the open-ended responses, found that eight (28 percent) were positive in nature, 17 (59 percent) expressed negative sentiments, and four commented on things other than associate faculty, e.g., the role of department chairs. The positive comments focused on the contributions and complementarity of associate faculty at PCC. Of the 17 negative comments, 11 addressed the weaknesses in the PCC system in support of associate faculty, 8 spoke to the low pay for associate faculty, and two mentioned both aspects. Readers will notice that the 11 comments regarding weaknesses in PCC associate-faculty systems vary widely. The overriding impression from reading all the comments is that PCC has a highly varied system for hiring, orienting, supervising, and evaluating associate faculty. There are different concerns and perspectives, depending on where you work in the system.

Discussion

The response to both surveys was exceptionally strong--indicating a particular interest in the subject of associate faculty utilization by both the associate faculty and department heads. The strong response rates and the resulting profile of respondents' characteristics tend to reinforce the validity and reliability of the survey data. Respondents appear to be closely representative of the associate-faculty population.

Associate Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications. The associate faculty respondents are mature, experienced, well-educated, and predominantly white male. The survey sample reflected twice as many Arts and Sciences instructors (N=481) as Vocational (N=228). Both groups of instructors tend to maintain professional contacts with their peers. Over half work in education or public administration, almost one-third in services, and relatively few in manufacturing, retail, or construction. Department heads are impressed with the quality and the value of the associate faculty pool; their responses, however, do not address the associate faculty potential for student role models among women and minorities.

Availability of Associate Faculty. Multiple indicators within the surveys confirm that the availability of associate faculty is generally not a problem for the College. On the contrary, associate faculty enhance the College's ability to offer courses of quality and variety at times and places where students want to learn. Yet this added flexibility comes at the risk that some valued associate faculty may be forced to cancel commitments on short notice and leave the department without an instructor.

Orientation of Associate Faculty. Orientation is taking place at all campuses, although the quality ratings show room for improvement. Department heads are more positive about the quality of the orientations than are the participating associate faculty.

Utilization of Associate Faculty. Utilization of associate faculty falls heavily in 16 subject areas, led by Math, Writing, Computer Science, Office Education, Accounting, Business, and Psychology. The College needs to further consider the costs and benefits of various hiring alternatives to support these high-use areas. On another dimension, relatively few associate faculty (13 percent) exceed the 6-credit-hour load limit. A high percentage of the respondents (52 percent) teach more than one course.

Problems in Using Associate Faculty. Department heads are more focused on problems than are the associate faculty. Department heads are most concerned about the compensation of associate faculty. For some, the College is taking advantage of talented people by providing low pay, no benefits, little support and opportunity for participation in College decisions. For others, the College's education services suffer when associate faculty quit on short notice or make other commitments for higher pay. Associate faculty, on the other hand, evince less concern about compensation. Associate faculty teach because they **want** to teach; only a minority (20 percent) considers compensation a factor and only 26 percent would rather be full-time faculty, although as many as half would **consider** it. Additional analysis of the data will be required to determine whether those with low personal income are also those who are teaching heavy course loads and waiting for full-time jobs.

At the same time it should be noted that associate faculty **are** concerned about compensation. Under the "Other Comments" section, approximately 14 percent were critical of associate faculty compensation at PCC. In this regard, the compensation issue appears to be a classic illustration of Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory: associate faculty are **motivated** by teaching (the "satisfier"). Pay is a **hygiene factor** (a dissatisfier). Pay can be a morale factor and an irritant, but it is not typically a controlling influence in the decision to teach or not to teach.

Department heads are also concerned about College systems to support associate faculty--recruitment, selection, orientation and training, support services, and evaluation. When these systems are weak, the quality of a majority of the College's course sections is continually at risk. Associate faculty respondents concur in this concern.

Benefits in Using Associate Faculty. Department heads have sent a clear message regarding the benefits of using associate faculty: they provide flexibility, needed expertise, and diversity. All of these benefits are issues of **quality** which affect the students' learning experience.

Summary

Utilization of associate faculty at PCC is working reasonably well from the perspective of associate faculty and department heads. Results of both surveys support the conclusion that associate faculty are well qualified and highly motivated.

Employing associate faculty can both enhance quality and put it at risk. The survey data indicate that quality stems from the flexibility, expertise, and diversity afforded by associate faculty. The risk is related to the tenuous relationship between the College and the associate faculty member.

The College quite clearly needs to take steps to--

o Address the issue of adequate compensation for associate faculty, not necessarily because the current compensation adversely affects the availability of qualified instructors. Rather, it is clearly a morale and an equity issue (a dissatisfier) for both associate faculty and department heads.

o Recognize the role of associate faculty as a major applicant pool for full-time faculty and its influence in achieving affirmative action goals for the College. At the same time, the College needs to recognize the under-utilization of minorities and women in its associate faculty ranks and make immediate adjustments so that those who comprise 83 percent of the PCC headcount faculty and who teach well over half of the course sections more closely reflect the gender and ethnicity of the students served.

o Consider additional FTE faculty slots targeted at those subject areas of heavy utilization of associate faculty, e.g. math, writing, computer science, office education.

o Install improved support systems for the recruitment, orientation, supervision, and evaluation of associate faculty.

o Improve benefits for associate faculty and increase their involvement in establishing directions and policies for the College.

The surveys indicate that the associate faculty is a powerful College resource which needs to be responsibly managed and nurtured in support of the College mission.

REFERENCES

Cease, Michael. "Utilization of Part-Time Faculty at Pima Community College." Unpublished course project, PRD 161, Tucson, AZ, April 1990.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Gorsuch, Carol A. "Faculty Council Motion Regarding Associate Faculty: Approved October 27, 1989," Inter-office memorandum, Pima Community College, Tucson, AZ, March 8, 1990.

Hartleb, David and William Vilter. "Part-time Faculty, Full-Time Problems," in New Directions for Community Colleges, 33, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man, Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

Pima Community College. Institutional Profile: Self-Study Report, Tucson, AZ, August 1988.

_____. Self-Study Report, 1990, Tucson, AZ, June 1990.

CREDITS

A number of persons made this study possible. Critical to the quick turnaround required for the data analysis were the data-entry specialists in Computer Services: Virginia Rivera, Nadine Morehouse, and Linda Zimmerman. Their attentiveness and extra-hour effort were crucial in meeting the timeline for this project.

Robert Coonce, Assistant Director of Computer Services for Computer Operations, advised in the development of the survey instruments, directed the data entry, and programmed the output for data analysis. Without his participation this study could not have been completed. Within the general practice of survey research, his contributions were of exceptional quality and were highly time-efficient.

Data entry and coding was performed effectively by Paula Richards, Diana Coonce, Susan Nides and Doris Garner. Clarisa Meza typed responses to open-ended questions.

Eva Yanez directed the design, development, and implementation of the survey of PCC department heads. She also supervised the data editing for both surveys. Helen Rebeske directed the design, development, and implementation of the survey of associate faculty. She also provided overall editing assistance for the final report. Together, Eva and Helen provided an understanding of the issues essential to meet the decision-making needs at Pima Community College.

Brenda Marshall Beckman provided ongoing guidance, direction, and communication linkages to assure a timely, quality, and responsive report. Carol Gorsuch and Ignacio Garcia provided essential guidance and resources for the completion of the project.

Of central importance to the study, of course, were the 757 associate faculty and 38 department heads who took this study with utmost seriousness and provided cogent responses.

The foregoing deserve all credit for whatever contributions this study may have for policy analysis at Pima Community College. The author of the report lays exclusive claim to any weakness or shortcomings which may be discovered in the report or in the approach to the study.

Pima Community College
District Service Center
200 North Stone Avenue
P.O. Box 3010
Tucson, Arizona 85702-3010

Office of the President
(602) 884-6047
FAX (602) 884-6290

June 28, 1990

Dear Associate Faculty Member:

Over the past several weeks, the role of Associate Faculty at Pima Community College has been the point of considerable discussion by the Board of Governors, the Faculty Council, and the College administration.

I need your help in making some recommendations to the Board of Governors about the role and function of Associate Faculty. The attached questionnaire will take only about ten minutes to complete. It will provide us with invaluable information for decision-making.

I hope you will do me the favor of filling out this questionnaire and returning it to me by return mail today, but no later than July 11. A postage-paid envelope is enclosed. I realize that this request comes in the heat of summer and with short turnaround, but I have promised the Board and the Faculty Council a report by the end of July.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Ms. Helen Rebeske (884-6228) or Dr. Philip Silvers (884-6745).

Please know that I value this information which only you can provide.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hockaday

Jeff Hockaday

PimaCommunityCollege

Survey of Associate Faculty

July 2, 1990

1. What courses (credit and non-credit) have you taught at Pima Community College since July 1, 1989?

Prefix	Number	Course Title	Credit Hours	Number of Sections
____	_____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. At which location(s) have you taught since July 1, 1989?

1. Community Campus
2. Downtown Campus
3. East Campus
4. West Campus
5. Education Center-South
6. Community Services (non-credit)
7. Skill Center

3. If you checked more than one location above, at which campus do you teach most often?

1. Community Campus
2. Downtown Campus
3. East Campus
4. West Campus
5. Education Center-South
6. Community Services (non-credit)
7. Skill Center

4. Have you ever turned down a part-time teaching position at Pima Community College?

1. Yes.
2. No.

_____ 5. If you answered yes to question 4, what was the most important reason you declined the offer?_____

6. Do you attend orientation sessions?

   1. Yes. 2. No. 3. What orientation sessions?

7. If you have attended orientation, how would you rate the quality of it?

Poor		Acceptable		Excellent
0	1	2	3	4 5

8. Please indicate your credentials that directly relate to the area(s) in which you teach:

   A. Academic qualifications:

   1. Associate's degree
   2. Bachelor's degree
   3. Master's degree
   4. Doctorate degree

_____ 5. Other. Please specify:_____

   B. Number of years of directly-related work experience:_____

   C. Number of years of teaching experience:_____

9. What is the primary reason you teach at Pima Community College? (Please circle one.)

   1. I just love to teach.
   2. The extra money comes in handy.
   3. It is important to me that someone highly-qualified teach this particular subject.
   4. I find teaching an enjoyable diversion from my regular job.
   5. I am in need of the income.
   6. Other. Please specify:_____

10. When were you first employed as an associate faculty member?

    Year:_____ 1. Fall 2. Spring 3. Summer

11. Do you teach:

    1. every semester?
    2. once a year?
    3. less than once a year?

12. How many credit hours do you normally teach at Pima Community College each semester?_____

13. Do you also teach at an institution other than Pima Community College?

A. If yes:

1. Full-time?
2. Part-time?

B. Type:

1. Elementary
2. Secondary
3. Four-year or university
4. Proprietary
5. Military
6. Other. Please specify_____

14. Please answer the following questions:

A. Please circle the answer which most closely describes your current employment status:

1. I work as an associate faculty member only.
2. I have a full-time job.
3. I have a part-time job.
4. I am waiting for full-time employment in my field.
5. Other. Please explain:_____

B. Please indicate your occupation and the industry in which you work:

1. Occupation:_____ 2. Industry:_____

C. Please indicate the range of your individual annual gross income. (All sources.)

1. Less than $10,000
2. $10,000 - $19,999
3. $20,000 - $29,999
4. $30,000 - $39,999
5. $40,000 - $49,999
6. $50,000 or more

15. If a full-time teaching position were opening now in my subject area I would apply for it.

1. Yes. 2. No. (Please skip to question 17.)

16. If a position were offered to me, I would accept it:

1. Outright.
2. Provided:_____

17. I have been an applicant for a full-time faculty position at Pima Community College in the past two years.

1. Yes. 2. No.

18. I teach on a part-time basis at Pima Community College only because I have been unable to secure a full-time position at the college.

1. Yes. 2. No.

19. I am available to teach: (Circle all that apply.)

A. Weekdays:
1. in the morning.
2. in the afternoon.
3. in the evening.

B. Weekends.

C. Location:
1. at any location.
2. only on the following campus(es).

1. Community Campus
2. Downtown Campus
3. East Campus
4. West Campus
5. Education Center-South
6. Community Services (non-credit)
7. Skill Center

20. I keep in regular contact with others who teach in the same subject area(s).

1. Yes. 2. No.

21. Information about you:

A. Gender:
1. male
2. female

B. Age:_____

C. Ethnicity
1. American Indian
2. Asian
3. Black
4. Hispanic
5. White

22. Other comments you may have:

PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Office of the Chancellor

July 3, 1990

Dear Department Head:

I am asking for your views on the role of Associate Faculty at Pima Community College on the enclosed questionnaire. During the past few weeks, Associate Faculty have been the subject of discussion of the Board of Governors, the Faculty Council, and the administration.

The information received from the questionnaire will help me make recommendations to the Board of Governors. I am counting on your experience to provide the data needed for decision-making in this important matter.

I know this request comes when many are away from the job but the turnaround time is short. Please do me the favor of filing out the questionnaire and returning it to me by no later than July 11. A postage paid envelope is enclosed or you may leave it in the Office of Research and Planning. I have promised the Board and the Faculty Council a report by the end of July.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Ms. Eva Yañez (884-6229) or Dr. Philip Silvers (884-6745).

I appreciate your help and I value the information that only you can provide. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hockaday

200 North Stone Avenue • P.O. Box 3010 • Tucson, Arizona 85702-3010 • (602) 884-6047 FAX (602) 884-6290

PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
On Associate Faculty Employment
July 1990

1. Approximately how many associate faculty do you employ each semester? _____

2. Of those employed in the Spring of 1990 (892), how many associate faculty were employed for the first time in your department? _____

3. What percent of the load hours were taught by associate faculty in your department in the Spring 1990 (892)? _____

4. How would you rate the quality of the orientation provided for new associate faculty?

Nonexistent		Acceptable		Excellent	
0	1	2	3	4	5

A. Don't attend/don't know: _____
B. Do attend. My comments: _____

_____

5. How would you rate the quality of the support services made available to your associate faculty?

Nonexistent		Acceptable		Excellent	
0	1	2	3	4	5

6. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction by the associate faculty in your department?

Poor		Acceptable		Excellent	
0	1	2	3	4	5

7. In general, what is your experience in recruiting associate faculty?

Almost Impossible		Reasonably Available		There is a Waiting List	
0	1	2	3	4	5

Exceptions (specify):

_____

_____

_____

8. In the Spring 1990 (892), was it necessary to cancel any courses because of lack of qualified faculty? _____

Specify course(s): _____

_____

9. What is the primary reason you are turned down when associate faculty decline an offer to teach? _____

_____

10. What is the primary stated reason associate faculty stop teaching in your department? _____

_____

11. What are the major **benefits** your department derives from using associate faculty? (Prioritize first three reasons.)

1.

2.

3.

12. What are the major **problems** your department experiences in using associate faculty? (Prioritize first three reasons.)

1.

2.

3.

13. Other comments about associate faculty:

_____

_____

_____

14. Information about you:

CAMPUS:
1. Community
2. Downtown
3. East
4. Education Center South
5. West

DEPARTMENT: _____

_____

Thank you. Please return to Office of Research and Planning, Room 309, District Service Center by July 11, 1990.

APPENDIX C

Other Comments from Department Heads

PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
On Associate Faculty Employment
July 1990

QUESTION #13. 1) TREAT ASSOCIATE FACULTY BETTER - DON'T EXPLOIT

Our system exploits part-timers. They should be paid more. They should be allowed to get professional growth points to build their major salaries, should be encouraged to take Pima classes at $15.00 e.g. Spanish, computers, all classes.

Associate Faculty are misused and abused at PCC. They should receive higher pay and there should be benefits for those teaching over 6 units. Secretaries do Associate Faculty work last. There should be administrator representatives on campuses at night and weekends to work with them.

If Pima College does not stop taking advantage of these people and begin to treat them as professionals, we are going to be in more serious trouble than we are.

QUESTION #13. 2) BETTER PAY

Associate Faculty pay is too low. We are having increasing difficulty in finding and keeping the best Associate Faculty.

Something MUST be done to INCREASE the amount we pay Associate Faculty.

The pay for Associate Faculty in a disgrace, but no worse than the dept. chair's compensation. A complete study needs to be made of the latter and the pay based at least 50% on dept. size. Now its about 21% on size.

These people are highly competent and qualified professionals. It is a disgrace to pay them as little and after no benefits as PCC does. Although many would prefer to teach at PCC, we frequently lose good faculty to the U of A simply for financial reasons.

QUESTION #13. 3) AN ASSET - PROFESSIONAL, PLEASANT, POSITIVE

Our Associate Faculty are very professional and pleasant to work with. Their attitudes are positive.

We've been lucky in that our Associate Faculty have been with us for several years. That helps - they know the Dept. routine, they are more like full time people who work fewer hours. All office support etc. is provided in house - it's easier on them - centralized support too far away from us to be of much value and they are not on campus except for their class - too time consuming

to run to the Associate Faculty Office.

I think I have an outstanding group of Associate Faculty who are very professional.

They are our backbone!

QUESTION #13. 4) CREATES FLEXIBILITY

A more flexible faculty than if they were full time.

It does allow for flexibility in an area like engineering where enrollments go through cycles. I don't think it should exceed 20% in a department like ours.

QUESTION #13. 5) ASSIGN MORE THAN 6.0 LOAD HOURS TO KEEP THE BEST

There appears to be a problem with assignment of Associate Faculty to more than two classes or 6.0 load hours on a district-wide basis.

If we find a good Associate Faculty we are limited to the number of classes they can teach. I would like to see qualified Associate Faculty be given "internal" status when new positions become available at Pima. That is one courtesy I think essential for maintaining good relations. Of course, paying them at least more than the University pays its TA's would also help.

Associate Faculty depending on PCC income are disadvantaged by the two-class-limitation. Can we legally devise a waiver of fringe benefit form and give more load? We are preprogrammed to hire the inexperienced and/or unsuccessful!

QUESTION #13. 6) NO EFFECTIVE WAY TO RATE QUALITY

Associate Faculty hired by East or Community Campus are not rated here. West Campus Department has no way to insure quality of content or instruction at other sites. There is no effective Program Management.

QUESTION #13. 7) PROVIDE BETTER SUPPORT AND TRAINING

Copy service not adequate for faculty who teach one time per week.

Student Advising, Faculty Communication and Staff support are difficult enough for full-time faculty to co-ordinate. These items are often lacking or most inadequate with the Associate Faculty.

Lawyers and legal assistants generally teach for reasons other than money. The pay barely covers expenses. The classes taught by

Associate Faculty require special expertise.

QUESTION #13. 8) NEED FOR POLICY ON ASSOCIATE FACULTY

The present administrative structure has, for the most part, hindered and diminished the role of the department chair in working with Associate Faculty.

An Associate Faculty organization and more formal titles (lectures/instructor, etc) would be a good idea whose time has come!

I spent 5 years as Associate Faculty, 1 year in Administrative Appointment - It is very rough part-time when you want full-time work. No benefits. No cuts in tuition. No consistency in form-filling.

Too many, no means for recruiting difficult to evaluate, no real policy for letting someone go.

QUESTION #13. 9) NO ANSWER

QUESTION #13. 10) REVIEW RATIO

Our outside accrediting agency - State Board of Nursing has identified that the percentage of Associate Faculty to full time faculty is too high.

QUESTION #13. 11) CREDENTIAL PROBLEMS FOR RURAL ASSOCIATE FACULTY

It is hard to certificate rural Associate Faculty/Course outlines; PRD courses, etc.

QUESTION #13. 12) SCHEDULING PROBLEMS

Several times they have advised me one day or two before the beginning of the new semester that they can not teach for my department. (A friend at one of the other campuses invited her/him to teach somewhere else).

QUESTION #13. 13) TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

While there is a movement towards increasing benefits for Associate Faculty, it must remain clear that they are PART TIME TEMPORARY employees - input from the group should carry no more (maybe less value than that of students).

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
APR 12 1991